UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/563,011	06/19/2006	Beatrice Schaack	284025US0XPCT	8486
	7590 06/07/201 AK, MCCLELLAND	EXAMINER		
1940 DUKE STREET			WHITEMAN, BRIAN A	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1635	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/07/2010	ELECTRONIC

# Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/563,011	SCHAACK ET AL					
		Examiner	Art Unit					
		Brian Whiteman	1635					
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).								
Status								
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 Ma	av 2010						
3)	<del>/ _</del>							
٥/١	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
	ological in accordance with the practice and in	n parte Quayre, 1000 c.b.	. 11, 400 0.0. 210.					
Dispositi	on of Claims							
4)🛛	Claim(s) <u>30-47</u> is/are pending in the application.							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>47</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
	5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>30-34</u> is/are allowed.							
6)🖂								
· —	Claim(s) 39 is/are objected to.							
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.						
Application Papers								
•	The specification is objected to by the Examine		y the Evaminer					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.								
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).								
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>								
2)  Notic 3)  Inforr	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s	ummary (PTO-413) )/Mail Date formal Patent Application 					

Art Unit: 1635

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Election/Restrictions

Newly submitted claim 47 directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: the composition in claim 47 and the product in claim 40 are related as combination and subcombination.

Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because can use a precursor or expression vector comprising a nucleotide sequence encoding casein kinase 2. The subcombination has separate utility such as treating cancer or for diagnosing cancer in a subject.

The examiner has required restriction between combination and subcombination inventions. Where applicant elects a subcombination, and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claim 47 withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

## Claim Objections

Claims 35-38 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim should refer to other claims in the alternative only. See MPEP § 608.01(n).

Claim 39 is objected to because of the following informalities: the phrase "an oligonucleotide as claimed in claim 30" is an improper phrase for a dependent claim. The phrase should read -- the oligonucleotide as claimed in claim 30 --. Appropriate correction is required.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 45 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a product containing a double-stranded oligonucleotide having a sense strand that consist of SEQ ID NO: 67, 83, and 86 for treatment of cancer or viral diseases, does not reasonably provide enablement for prevention of cancer or viral diseases using the product. The specification does not

enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

With respect to the limitation 'prevention of cancer' in claim 45 and limitation 'prevention of viral diseases' in claim 46, the specification provides no working example of a compound that can prevent cancer or a viral disease in a subject. While it is acknowledged that the specification does not require a working example for the claimed invention to be considered enabled, the claimed invention is not considered to be routine in the art. The specification fails to define what constitutes preventing. It is noted that patent protection is granted in return for an enabling disclosure of an invention, not for vague intimations of general ideas that may or may not be workable (See Brenner v. Manson, 383 U.S. 519, 536, 148 USPQ 689, 696 (19663, Stating, in context of the utility requirement, that "a patent is not a hunting license. It is not a reward for the search, but compensation for its successful conclusion") Tossing out the mere germ of an idea does not constitute enabling disclosure. While every aspect of a generic claim certainly need not have been carried out by an inventor, or exemplified in the specification, reasonable detail must be provided in order to enable members of the public to understand and carry out the invention.

At the effective filing date of the present application, using double stranded oligonucleotides to inhibit expression of casein kinase 2 to prevent cancer or viral disease in a subject was not known to one of skilled in the art.

Accordingly, due to the lack of sufficient guidance provided by the specification regarding to the issues set forth above, the unpredictability of the relevant art on

modulating an expression casein kinase 2 to prevent cancer or prevent viral diseases in a subject, and the breadth of the claims, it would have required undue experimentation for one skilled in the art to **make and use** the instant broadly claimed invention.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 46 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 46 recites the limitation "A product containing at least one oligoribonucleotide in Claim 30" in lines 1 and 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claim 30 is directed to a double-stranded oligonucleotide

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The term "precursor" in claim 35 and claims dependent therefrom is not defined by the instant specification. The phrase "A precursor of the oligonucleotide as claimed in claim 35" reads on any oligonucleotide (starting material) that can be used to produce the double-stranded oligonucleotide of claim 30. The antisense strand in the double-

Art Unit: 1635

stranded oligonucleotide recited in claim 30 reads on a sequence that is complementary to SEQ ID NO: 67, 83 and 86. Any sequence that is complementary to these sequence identifiers is embraced by the precursor in the claims. Thus, the claimed product in claim 35 reads on a gene encoding a beta-subunit of casein kinase 2.

Claims 35-38, 40, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mukerji et al. (US 6,287,866). Mukerji et al. teach a plasmid comprising beta-casein expressing construct (Figure 1, SEQ ID NO: 1).

Claims 35-38 and 40-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Frudakis et al (US 6,225,054). Frudakis et al. teach DNA vaccine comprising a nucleotide sequence comprising SEQ ID NO: 217 and an adjuvant or a substance that makes it possible to cross the plasma membrane or a substance that allows targeting cells (SEQ ID NO: 217 is 90.5% identical to SEQ ID NO: 67, 83, and 86). See columns 3, 4, and 14-15.

### Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian Whiteman whose telephone number 571-272-0764. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:30 to 4:00 (Eastern Standard Time). The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's acting supervisor Fereydoun Sajjadi can be reached on 571-272-3311. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

Application/Control Number: 10/563,011 Page 8

Art Unit: 1635

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Brian Whiteman/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1635